REMARKS

1.   Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-24 are presently pending in this application. In this Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 10-14 and 19-24. The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,449,642 ("Bourke-Dunphy"). The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brourke-Dunphy and claims 3, 8 and 17 as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,522 ("Young").

2.   Response to §112 Rejection of Claim 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under §112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that it is the client device that receives the configuration data from the service provider, and accordingly request that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

3.   Response to §102 Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 15

Claim 1 provides a method for automatically configuring a client device for communication with a service provider (e.g. an Internet service provider (ISP)). A user of a client device selects a service provider from a plurality of service providers. Next, the user enters user information data (e.g., user's location, a username, user's e-mail address, and credit information) on the client device. The client device then accesses the service provider and provides the service provider with the user information data. The service provider then creates configuration data based on the provided user information data. The client device receives the

8

configuration data and uses it to configure the client device for future communication with the service provider. This is neither taught nor suggested in any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Bourke-Dunphy is generally directed to a system and method for integrating a client computer into a computer network. As described, a Set-Up Computer Wizard ("SCW") can be used for controlling the installation of applications to a client computer. (Summary, col. 1, lines 42-43). As described in Bourke-Dunphy, the "SCW presents a list of applications from which the user can choose for installation to the client computer as shown in the GUI of FIG. 10." (col. 5, lines 31-33). The Examiner quotes this passage for the proposition that Bourke-Dunphy teaches Applicants' element of "selecting a service provider by a user on the client device, wherein the user selects the service provider from a plurality of service providers."

However, this section in Bourke-Dunphy describes choosing a list of applications and not service providers. The applications in Bourke-Dunphy are computer programs, such as Microsoft™ Word, Microsoft™ Excel or other such programs. This is in contrast to the service providers (e.g., ISPs) claimed by Applicants. Moreover, Bourke-Dunphy makes clear that the "SCW executes on server 20." (col. 4, line 40). Thus, this step in Bourke-Dunphy does not occur on the client device. Applicants' claim 1, however, includes "selecting a service provider by a user on the client device."

As Bourke-Dunphy does not teach or suggest selecting a service provider, let alone on a client device, it does not teach or suggest all elements of Applicants' independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-14 are allowable.

Claim 15 includes the similar element of querying a user for a service provider, wherein the client device is arranged to provide a user with an ability to select one of a plurality of

9

service providers. For the reasons previously discussed with respect to independent claim 1, this element is neither taught nor suggested by Bourke-Dunphy. Therefore, independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16-24 are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicants submit that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. If any questions or issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney, Brian Harris, at his direct dial number (312) 913-3303.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF

Date: 7/26/04

By: _____
Brian R. Harris
Registration No. 45,900

10